

## Cell phones, cordless phones, and Wi-Fi have been linked to cancer and other negative health effects. So has 5G and V2V

Public funding should only be used to fund wired broadband e.g. cable, DSL, fiber optic, not wireless broadband. Companies should be on their own dime for that and no responsible public entity should be encouraging wireless now that the science so clearly shows that it is dangerous.

Two federal agencies have stated that the FCC limits for RF radiation emitted by wireless technology do not protect us from biological harm during the chronic exposures we are experiencing today. (In addition to the U.S. National Toxicology Program finding radiation from wireless technology causes cancer and DNA breakage at non-thermal levels - <http://ehtrust.org/science/facts-national-toxicology-program-cellphone-rat-cancer-study/>)

The Department of Interior stated "the electromagnetic radiation standards used by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) continue to be based on thermal heating, a criterion now nearly 30 years out of date and inapplicable today."([http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/us\\_doi\\_comments.pdf](http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/us_doi_comments.pdf))

The Environmental Protection Agency stated "The FCC's current exposure guidelines, as well as those of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) and the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection, **are thermally based, and do not apply to chronic, nonthermal exposure situations.** They are believed to protect against injury that may be caused by acute exposures that result in tissue heating or electric shock and burn. The hazard level (for frequencies generally at or greater than 3 MHz) is based on a specific absorption dose-rate, SAR, associated with an effect that results from an increase in body temperature. The FCC's exposure guideline **is considered protective of effects arising from a thermal mechanism but not from all possible mechanisms.** Therefore, the generalization by many that the guidelines protect human beings from harm by any or all mechanisms is not justified." ([http://www.emrpolicy.org/litigation/case\\_law/docs/noi\\_epa\\_response.pdf](http://www.emrpolicy.org/litigation/case_law/docs/noi_epa_response.pdf)). As the EPA makes plain, the FCC RF radiation limits are not protective from all adverse effects only those from thermal mechanisms during acute exposures. FCC RF radiation limits are based on thermal effects in a large male. They are not population-protective. They do not and were never intended to protect from biological effects or even thermal effects during the chronic exposures we all experience today.

The telecom industry is sowing doubt and confusion just as the tobacco industry did years ago. I hope you will take the time to look at the evidence being put forward by dedicated researchers who are independent of the industry. Thousands of peer-reviewed papers show that there are serious and potentially very harmful biological effects that have been linked to exposure to radiation from wireless devices and electromagnetic fields. These thousands of peer-reviewed papers have been reviewed in the 2012 BioInitiative Report which can be found at [www.bioinitiative.org](http://www.bioinitiative.org). While the industry claims the "BioInitiative Report" is "non-scientific" and "hardly credible", the report is chock full of information from highly reputable scientists around the world and the industry does not want the public to become aware of the truth. It is not a question of **if** we will all collectively stop wireless proliferation, but **when**. I hope the US can lead the way in saying NO to more radiofrequency radiation, a Class 2B carcinogen just like lead and DDT.

In 2015, over 220 scientists from 41 countries with over 2,000 peer-reviewed journal articles to their collective credit in the field of biological impacts from RF/EMF appealed to the U.N. and the WHO for greater precautions with regard to exposures from wireless technologies (<https://www.emfscientist.org/>).

Captured Agency: How the Federal Communications Commission Is Dominated by the Industries It Presumably Regulates by Norm Alster, published recently by Harvard University's Edmond J. Safra

Center for Ethics [http://ethics.harvard.edu/files/center-for-ethics/files/capturedagency\\_alster.pdf](http://ethics.harvard.edu/files/center-for-ethics/files/capturedagency_alster.pdf) is an excellent resource for understanding why you should not be depending on the FCC to regulate the the Telecom industry or assure safety of wireless technology.

The FCC has been, to put it mildly, very lax in regulating the Telecom industry on many fronts. A detailed investigation by the EMR Policy Institute showed almost no enforcement of existing FCC RF limits and rampant violations (<http://www.marketwire.com/press-release/-1770139.htm>). A Wall Street Journal investigation (<http://online.wsj.com/articles/cellphone-boom-spurs-antenna-safety-worries-1412293055>) reports similar findings with one in ten towers out of compliance and experts concerned that out of compliance towers could be transmitting in the thermal range by around the end of 2015.

Radiation from wireless technology is not just harming humans, but also animals and plants. The article "Radiofrequency radiation injures trees around mobile phone base stations" ([https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306435017\\_Radiofrequency\\_radiation\\_injures\\_trees\\_around\\_mobile\\_phone\\_base\\_stations](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306435017_Radiofrequency_radiation_injures_trees_around_mobile_phone_base_stations)) shows how seriously wireless technology damages trees. "Impacts of radio-frequency electromagnetic field (RF-EMF) from cell phone towers and wireless devices on biosystem and ecosystem – a review" discusses the very serious impacts radiation from wireless technology has on wildlife ([http://www.biolmedonline.com/Articles/Vol4\\_4\\_2012/Vol4\\_4\\_202-216\\_BM-8.pdf](http://www.biolmedonline.com/Articles/Vol4_4_2012/Vol4_4_202-216_BM-8.pdf)). Taken together they are a warning of dire consequences for environmental damage from continued proliferation of wireless technology.

**EUROPAEM [European Academy for Environmental Medicine] EMF Guideline 2016 for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of EMF-related health problems and illnesses** (<https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/reveh.ahead-of-print/reveh-2016-0011/reveh-2016-0011.xml?format=INT>) emphasizes the importance of minimizing exposure to radiation from wireless technology to protect public health and make public institutions accessible to those who have already been injured by too much exposure radiation from wireless technology.

Children and pregnant women are particularly at risk from WiFi exposure. Please watch (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sNFdZVeXw7M>), a succinct presentation by Dr. Erica Mallory-Blythe about the very real threat that radiation from wireless technology poses to our children's health.

I am very concerned for the future health of Americans and also for the health of trees and wildlife in this country if increases in the use of wireless continues. Please don't fall for the industry's "alternate" facts. Only fund or promote **wired** broadband. **Vote "No" on bills promoting hazardous technology like wireless broadband.**

**Say NO to V2V and 5G**

Sincerely,  
**Naveen Albert, Wisconsin Constituent**  
3604 Bayberry Drive  
Waukesha, WI  
53189-6833

[mail@interlinked.x10host.com](mailto:mail@interlinked.x10host.com)